


60,246-225
10,129REMARKS

The Examiner bases all of his rejections on the combination of *Montes* and *DeWitt* or the combination of *Montes* and *Edgar*. Essentially, he argues that placing connections transverse to one another is taught by either *DeWitt* or *Edgar* and that one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to do so with *Montes*. Applicant requests the Examiner, however, consider that *Montes* teaches only one snap-fit connection in one direction. While the prior art teaches two connections transverse to one another generally, there is nothing in the prior art that indicates that both connections are snap-fit connections. The Examiner assumes so when it is also possible that one connection could be a snap-fit connection and the other an ordinary connection. There is no teaching, motivation or suggestion that both connections be snap-fit connectors in two different directions. In fact, both *Edgar* and *DeWitt* teach away from their combination with *Montes* as noted previously. For these reasons, all pending claims stand in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS

By: 


Anthony P. Cho
Registration No. 47,209
400 W. Maple Rd., Ste. 350
Birmingham, MI 48009
(248) 988-8360

Dated: January 12, 2007

60,246-225
10,129

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE

I hereby certify that this Request for Reconsideration relative to Application Serial No. 10/631,193 is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office (Fax No. (571) 273-8300) on January 12, 2007.


Theresa M. Palmateer

N:\Clients\CARRIER\IP00225\PATENT\Request for Reconsideration 1-07.doc